

Attachment A
Transcript of Public Comments
Workshop No. 3
New Water Supply Agreement
Petaluma Community Center
March 28, 2002

Introduction:

Professor Tom Jacobson opened workshop by reviewing process and what had occurred at Workshops 1 and 2. He reviewed information made available and then presented the purpose of and ground rules for Workshop 3, namely to further discuss the issues and comment on the list of 56 possible responses to be considered in negotiating the new agreement focusing on those responses regarding:

- Watershed Management (Possible Responses 10 through 13),
- Water Supply (14-17) and
- Ground Water (32-38) / Gravel Mining (44, 45).

These were the issue areas identified by public participants in Workshop 2 as having the highest priority for further discussion. He introduced John Nelson, the consultant hired by the water contractors to facilitate the negotiation among the parties to the agreement and noted Mr. Nelson was available to clarify and answer questions.

Transcript of Comments Received at Workshop 3

Jean Redus, Atascadero Greenville Watershed Council: I live in Gratin. And I wanted to ask whether this list of 56 possible responses was compiled by a small group of people since the last workshop?

Tom: The list of 56 was the list of 30 some at the last workshop. Primarily the way that list has been compiled has been by John Nelson. We after each of these workshops have gone to what the input was and, then I've said to John and John has said to me ok what sorts of things might be responded or might be responses to those concerns? So, again the reason that we are not representing that as being the last word on the subject is that it is primarily intended to be a simulate to discussion. That's what we will be doing this evening, so the answer to your question is, mainly has come from John but not as the exhaust of the last word on the subject.

A. Watershed management

10 *With ample opportunity for input from stakeholders, periodically quantify the best possible water resource mix including all available supplies such as conservation, recycling, ground water and surface water taking into account levels of reliability, and watershed needs and other environmental impacts. (Please note that this recommendation is common to all three categories and is the same as Item No. 1 in the list of 56 possible responses recommended by the Negotiation Facilitator.)*

Martin Kerkvliet, Oak Tree Alliance: I would like to suggest that best possible water resource by definition is that which promotes the thriving ecosystems for all native flora and fauna.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: Two comments: One is I think periodically needs to have some better definition or periodically could mean just about anything. Maybe yearly, bi-yearly something like that, and the other point is; I'm just wondering if we

should be addressing somehow or adding in there some comment about the extent to which we will be relaying on inter-basin transfers of water. Thank you.

Dave Keller, Friends of the Eel River former Petaluma Council Member: The language itself has a problem, the word “opportunity for input” is not sufficient, and it is with ample input, period. The job of the people who are drifting this master agreement is to make sure that there is input from the stakeholders not just opportunities, and I think once again, if you look around this room I know there are some people that are coming done from the north coast but not many. And the north coast is desperately affected by the water policies here in Marin and Sonoma County. The other thing is that, best possible water resource mix “best” is undefined and that really is the crux of what’s wrong with this statement about watershed management. There needs to be objective, there needs to be a goal that is larger, that is larger than any of this, and that is. I am again going to use the New York City, watershed model, which is watershed management for potable supply in perpetuity. We need to state what “best” means and without that there is no way to understand or to determine what any of the rest of this stuff means because it’s arbitrary, it’s all capricious, it’s decided at the moment. So, it really needs to define what that means and what the larger objectives are. If we’re going to use the Russian River as a water source forever, then we need to say that, and that the water policies are then derived from that objective.

Diane Reilly-Torres, Board of Directors at PCA (Petaluma Community Access): I just wanted to say that we are filming it tonight, not live, it’ll be on probably within a week on channel 27 or 28 and there will be copies available if anyone wants to purchase them. So, that’s, Now, I said they where filming tonight and it will be on Petaluma community access within about a week and if anybody wanting to purchase copies can contact Petaluma Community Access. Ok, I am going to put on my other hat, my name is Diane Reilly-Taurus and I am a resident of Petaluma and I think we on watershed management, I believe, and I find it kind of offensive to get everybody else’s input and then we have to read all this material, it’s very hard to do. Maybe next time you go around you can start at the bottom of the river and work your way up starting at Petaluma and let us be the first ones to put input because it’s very hard to absorb all this material. Thank you.

Jack Gibson, Marin Municipal Water District Board Member: I am at least on this comment at this moment speaking on behave of the board, we considered the 50 plus items at our last board meeting for the purpose of giving me some direction and on this specific issue. I can tell you that the sense of my board is very specifically, that the conservation and recycling should be given a high priority in the mix and that there should also be a regional approach on both of those issues.

Tom: And let me add if I may raise an important point that each of the contracting water contractors has been provided the same list of 56 with the request that they also go through process of evaluating there positions, changes and additions. That information is being gathered and, I think John is intended to provide it by next week?

John Nelson: The responses from the contractors on the list of 56 plus their additions and comments on deletions are due March 4th. One of the city’s, I think is going to be later than that. I’ll be summarizing this information by the next WAC meeting, which will be the first meeting April. I do want to respond while I have the mike to David Keller. I was very I sensitive to trying to get people from the north coast here. We do have some people from the Eel River country here tonight by the way. How many, please raise your hands, from the Eel River area. I went up to the Ukiah meeting on water that was held on February 9th. Saturday, a half day meeting and provided those people with information about our workshops. They had already been mailed the information previously but hadn’t responded that they wanted to be on our list. So, I got them

back on the list. I see that they are not here. We're trying. Maybe if we invite them as speakers we can get them.

Chris DeGabriele, Manager, North Marin Water District: and I think that, there has been opportunity for input from stakeholders. That's how we gotten to this point in time with the list of 56. North Marin Water district certainly supports this concept, we don't know yet what the best possible water resource mix is, so an investigation is necessary to undertake and this is pointing us in that direction and I believe is worthwhile effort for all of the contractors in the water agency to take on.

Anne Layzer, League of Women Voters of Marin County: John, I am going to say something mean and that is, I think the language that this document is written in is not the way most people talk. I think it has a bureaucratic quality to it that is not welcoming to the ordinary public. It seems to announce that you have to know a whole lot about the subject before you can approach it, and engage in this conversation.

John Rosenblum: I'm here as an interested citizen but, I am also an engineer and although I like the direction of this statement quantifying the best possible mix implies. A lot of work which implies a lot of funding and that's going to be the key of whether we get the best mix or not or whether we get accurate quantification or not.

Lee Harry, Valley of the Moon Water District: I've had involvement with integrated resource plans before, and I just like to say that when you determine best possible mix. It really has to do with establishing a hierarchy. Where I was in Southern California they established hierarchy simply on escalating cost. Ground water being cheapest, surface water was next, and then they went into conservation, reclaimed water and all the way up to desalination. I think what we're trying to do here, representing our individual ratepayers. Is we're trying to tell ya all we want to develop a hierarchy that's based not only on escalating cost but also environmental aspects and levels of reliability, so we are trying to work in the same direction. How we get there when we have ten different agencies trying to represent the whole county and Marin County is difficult. Thank you.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: Just one quick comment. I guess one of my big concerns is that ample opportunity for input does not allow for, necessarily people from the public having a say or have a real role in the decision process. This does not really express whether or not, that input would be taken seriously or to what extent, it will be absorbed. Thank you.

Geoff Cartwright: From Petaluma, and this statement here gives me the wrong impression. Periodically qualified the best possible water resource mix including all available supplies such as, conservation, recycling ground water and surface water taking into account levels of reliability. There's an implication that we've got water, and if you read the documents we are a little short on that.

George Amoroli, North Marin Water District Board Member: Warm Springs dam at the low ebb of October 31, of any year has about 200,000 thousand-acre feet of water in it. That's a three-year supply for all of the partners within the Sonoma County Water Agency so there is a tremendous supply. Having said that North Marin is a leader in conservation and we tend to agree with Marin Municipal's statement. We require front-loading washing machines in new connections today. We require people who sell their homes to have their toilets and shower and other fixtures up to the water conservation standards that you would have in a new home under

the codes. So, programs carried out on a cost effective basis have gotten results greater than the cost of these programs. So, we think we're a good shepherd of the resources and we do agree that conservation has a tremendous effect on new supply. Thank you.

Alex Forman, Marin Municipal Water District Board Member: I think the problem with this, and I really appreciate the attempt of the language to be broad and inclusive and establish some kind of consensus is that word "best". Would "best" for who, "best" for what and I think that's always the question when you are talking about water. Cause what might be "best" for a developer might not be "best" for the fish, for example so I think it is a very tricky wording problem. I don't think the word "best" kind of gets us out of, the questions we are facing as a region with our water supply. So I mean, I guess, I would suggest revising that, and use more specific goals that stress ecological soundness and reliability of water supply. But I think the word "best" is a nice attempt to get out of the difficulty we all face today.

Bill Phillips: When it comes to the two lakes that we consider reservoirs, Sonoma being one just mentioned. Sonoma has an earth and dam. Sonoma is a breeding lake for steelhead and Dry Creek is involved in protecting the species, so we cannot just think of draining that lake dry, it's not suited to that. It's an earthen dam and you cannot pull water out off the top without destroying the temperature in the thermal cline of the lake. The problem is much more complex than just sucking all the water out of there at time of need. It's just not that way.

A. Watershed management – continued:

- 11 *Include a methodology for identifying watershed restoration costs appropriately allocable to water contractors that are not or cannot be met from taxes and charges deposited in the Russian River Projects fund or from other appropriate sources.*
- 12 *As part of the negotiation process, review SCWA's plans for use of monies deposited in the Russian River Project Fund and consider what voice the water contractors should have with regard to fund expenditures and what agreement provisions should be considered regarding same.*
- 13 *Request Sonoma County to explore ways and means of addressing regional watershed management (via the Russian River Watershed Council or some other means) and, as part of the negotiation process, address water contractors' responsibility regarding same.*

Nadananda, Friends of the Eel River: I'm concerned about one of the comments that was made but also your comment of what is missing, and what is missing is how the Eel River mixes into the Russian River water and it's reliance by the Agency in supplying. Now, the system that supplies the water to the Russian River at this point is, it's license is up in 20 years. That system is about to be undergoing its 100th anniversary in the next 6 years. That's a pretty long time for a dam, especially since the American Association of Dam Engineers say that dams are old by the time they reach 50. We all know there's changes coming, however, just even looking at watershed management, and then later your water supply, I would think that the management would also have to address the longevity of the water supply that you now have. Lake Sonoma is not fully available until the Eel River issues are worked out because in the contracts that the Water Agency has with the state, it states in there when they ask question of the Water Agency "What will you do, what are your backup plans?" if you were to loose one or both of the dams, or a tunnel from natural processes, or at this point, this part is not in the contract, but we all know that decommissioning is going to get looked at, so just how is this being looked at in the mix for

water management. Are you setting up a management system for 20 years, is that it? The 92% of the water that is wanted out of the water source and transmission supply project is not secured.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: On the other side, on watershed management, on # 11, it says look to identifying watershed restoration costs, however we need to be looking at strategies, policies and of course, the goals laid out for those entire watersheds. Just looking at identifying the costs is not sufficient, and how to allocate those costs. Likewise, in # 13, requesting the county to explore ways and means of addressing regional watershed management is useless. Politically, we know exactly what the answer to that request will be, which is go to hell with you, okay. This has to be a mandate from the contractors that says we are going to explore ways and means of addressing regional watershed management, period, as a condition of the contract. A request to the board of supervisors on this issue? We already have heard their answer so the contractors need to exercise their rights, their privileges, and their power to say this is important enough to us, it will be part of this package.

Chris DeGabriele, North Marin Water District: We concur with item 11, with some changes, and I think to add some specificity to it. That the allocation of costs for watershed, habitat and fisheries studies and restoration be appropriately allocated to the contractors, other beneficiaries of the Russian River resource, and other land use activities affecting the watershed, the habitat and the fisheries, so I think that gets to some of the points that Mr. Keller is raising. With regard to item 12, we certainly agree with that because North Marin and Marin Municipal make special contributions to the Russian River Projects Fund to put us on an equal and equitable playing field with all of the Sonoma County customers of the Agency, so we agree that we should pay into that fund so we are carrying our share, but we believe that there should be some contractor ability to participate in how those projects are developed and funded. With regard to item 13, I won't use the vernacular that Mr. Keller used, but that's a very broad watershed encompassing several counties, and I think it's beyond that contractors ability or authority to affect something like that, although we may have a say in it, I don't know that we have the where-with-all to see something like that come into play.

Geoff Cartwright: Petaluma, again, and I'd like to speak about the cost for a moment. It was mentioned of the use of Lake Sonoma the Warm Springs dam waters, and I would point out those waters are designated as surface waters by the state, and there's a requirement for a filtration plant. The early estimates for the cost of the filtration plant were half a billion dollars, and that's an old figure and I'm sure as we all know, going through the grocery store, we see the climbing costs. And I'm sure that the figure by now is in the figure of around one billion dollars for that filtration plant. You have to keep in mind that that cost is a cost that will be added to your water bill. Thank you.

Diane Reilly-Torres, PCA: Let's see, number 11, talking about the restoration costs, is that the ESA (Endangered Species Act) compliance? Just want to confirm what that means. Does anybody know?

John Nelson: it actually goes beyond ESA, it includes work required under the Corp of Engineers contract with the Agency - obligations for certain maintenance along the channels, etc. In a broad sense, it's all those things: stream bank maintenance, watershed restoration that might be necessary for quality, as well as fish, etc.

Diane Reilly-Torres: Okay, thank you. Well I question the fact that they are using Zone 2A money which is flood control money for that. I don't think they should be using that money or flood control project money for that. In the number 12, since Mr. DeGabriele brought it up, my

understanding is that Marin and North Marin Water Districts don't pay the storage charge and we Petaluma aqueduct customers do, and I don't understand why we had to enter into an MOU agreement on Kastania tank if they don't use our storage, and whose going to be paying for the new Kastania tank? I'm still unclear about that. Let's see, number 13, what I'd like to see, and this is a little more positive, I'd like to see the Sonoma County Water Agency update the master drainage plans for all the areas, and they could even do it for Marin County. They could do it for all the contractors, and that would include ground water and all that stuff. Thanks.

John Rosenblum: What concerns me with this is that its being compartmentalized again and again, and I think David Keller, already suggested that we need to take a general approach, and that's why I feel uncomfortable with all of these. The first question is does anyone agree to what the quality of the watershed really is, or is there degradation, I mean, we're dancing around that subject but everyone in this room has a different interpretation. Just bringing up tiny little pieces and trying to address piecemeal, we're never going to get anywhere. It's just, there's something missing. That's all I wanted to say.

Tom: Any suggestions?

John Rosenblum: My suggestion is first of all, ask ourselves, is there common ground between us on the interpretation and the implications of the different interpretations, so instead of someone saying, for example, very simplistically, there has to be 7 fish in the Eel River. If we say okay, this person wants to restore it to what it was like in the 1800's, what is the implication to Marin? Is there enough water for the users in Marin? Can both objectives be fulfilled? And then you start working from that general idea that we're going to find common ground. And maybe you don't have to compartmentalize everything, but look for common ground, maybe that's what I'm feeling is missing here.

Jack Gibson, Marin Municipal Water District Board Member: again. I think I agree with Chris DeGabriele, that we have to, the methodology we're talking about has to be very specific and I think we have other ways to bring other users in, when we're allocating costs and to figure out exactly what the proportionate share of costs are, and secondarily really relating to point 13 here, I think we have to recognize that watersheds don't recognize our jurisdictional boundaries, so to seriously approach any kind of watershed management it has to be a regional effort. I think that's absolutely critical and a necessity. I agree with David and it can't be by request, it's got to be something that the contract sets forth and is clear and mandated.

Anne Layzer, League of Women Voters, Marin: I also felt that the language is very fuzzy on point 12. Particularly what it means to consider what voice the water contractors should have with regard, does it imply that you do more than, do you redefine the way that the contractors have a voice in the process.

Tom: recommendation?

Anne Layzer: I think it's a hard issue to understand, I know that the contractors feel that they want to have a stronger voice. One of the things that I'm wondering is if they want to have different voices, do they agree that they have the same interests. I've also been concerned- most of the advocacy I've seen at these workshops is for a much more environmentally sensitive approach. One of the questions I've raised is, is that an expensive way of providing water? If you take better care of the resources, will it make the water more expensive? And as a close observer of the political scene, I know that often members of water boards are praised or rebuked as a result of what the price of water is. And so if the people who have come to these workshops

advocating on behalf of more environmental protections, are they ones, if it makes the water more expensive, are they the ones who will be held accountable for it. Because, and would the citizens also agree that they want to pay more for their water in order to protect the resource. I think George might say, actually, George Amaroli, that some of the environmental protections that you put in make the water cheaper or make it possible not to make more costly capital investments.

George Amaroli, North Marin Water District Board Member: If you do a cost effectiveness analysis, and there's a four way perspective - you don't do it just the participant, there's a non-participant, there's a utility ratepayer and there's society as a whole. The one that encompasses the most is society as a whole but that test is a very difficult test to make. But if you have cost effective programs, you will actually drive down the cost of water. And our programs have differed from other agencies because we do make those tests. And we always start our programs with a new development because there's nothing there. So whether you put a three and a half gallon toilet or a six-gallon toilet or cash for grass or whatever you do, you are putting it in a bare situation. And having done that since 1973, we've booked a lot of money that we can use on retrofits now. So, yes you can reduce your cost but you have to know what you're doing.

Pam Torliatt, Petaluma City Council Member: I'm also the representative to the Water Advisory Committee for our Council. In respect to the process I think the Water Advisory Committee, and the councils and the contractors have said yes, we're willing to endeavor in a process of getting public input. Secondly, I think the next step is that the water contractors and those wanting to be other primary water contractors have to say yes, we want to be part of a regional watershed management solution because we are only one part of a larger area, a larger watershed management system. I recently went to, last Tuesday night, to the Water Resources Element first citizens advisory Committee for the County's general plan. Basically, my interpretation of what we found there was there really isn't a lot of information regarding groundwater, the county isn't tracking it now, and they probably aren't going to start tracking it at least for another 3 to 4 years, the way its going because of the way the process is set up. And I'm hoping this citizens advisory committee will have more input into maybe coordinating a timeline and steps for implementing a regional watershed management program. In addition to that, it seems to me maybe a solution or a way to get there is we have our contractors, we have the county, we have the water agency which is the same governing body, but do we have an advisory committee that is made up of all of the stakeholders, or stakeholders that are in this watershed that live off of the water that we are talking about making sure it stays sustainable and renewable and the quality is good and its used for the reasons that it needs to be used for which is all different reasons, ag., the communities and for the fish. So maybe that's a way that the water agency and the Board of Supervisors.... *(tape change)*

Alex Forman, Marin Municipal Water District Board Member: I wanted to talk mostly about point 13. I think this should be much more specific based on what David Keller and other people, and Pam raised, and something to the effect of we recognize the need to address issues of watershed management based on providing for long term sustainability and ecological integrity. That's just something I came up with now. The problem with the way it is now is that I don't think as a water contractor, we don't want them to just say we're asking someone else to do this. We have a responsibility to do it. We don't want to use water in such a way that 20 or 50 years from now, we've done some damage. We want the long-term sustainability built into our use of water. At Marin we use our own water that we have in our system, we also use water from the Russian River. I think I can speak for our Board, that we feel a responsibility to all the water that we use, and we don't want to just be requesting somebody else SCWA, to explore ways. We want it in the agreement that all the people in this agreement take that as their responsibility, their

stewardship responsibility. I think that's something we could specifically strengthen in 13. Thank you.

Lee Harry, Valley of the Moon Water District: I was real happy to hear someone mention tonight about the cost issue and the rates. As a general manager of a water district we look at this watershed protection thing, and everything that we do here if we're going to adopt all of these recommendations are going to have to be passed on to our ratepayers. What I would suggest is that the other agencies, other regulatory agencies at both the state and federal level that certainly should be contributing funds for this, and we shouldn't be as a collective group of water contractors, that are trying their best to supply water to our customers, and to also do the watershed and environmental work that is necessary, be required to go this expense alone. Because the gentleman over there was correct, this is going to have to be passed on to our individual ratepayers. So, I'd maybe like to see something added to this, to say that we would expend all available effort to obtain cooperation from the regulatory agencies, and also funding recommendations, or requirements from them to help us with this process. One other comment is that the comment on conservation that the gentleman from North Marin made is very good but that really doesn't address specifically watershed protection because there is no guarantee that the conservation that you conserve is going to that particular endeavor. It could be going to increased development etcetera. So, in this particular case, I really think we ought to concentrate on trying to develop some way to do what we need to do but get funding from other sources so that we don't have to pass this all on to the people that are already paying fairly high water rates. Thank you.

Ann Maurice, Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water: I'd like to say to Pam Torliatt with regards to the General Plan and the work they are doing on the water supply: of course it's known what the water situation is here. If the people who are working on the General Plan are not owning up to it, this is a major problem. I don't think you have to go very far to talk to the people of this community to know exactly what the water situation is. I find that the biggest problem is avoiding denying, minimizing the problem that we all know exists. And denying discussing the elephant that is lying in the middle of the floor. There's no question about the number of acres of irrigated farming that has gone in the last few years as opposed to non-irrigated farming. All you have to do is call the Farm Bureau, call up the Resource Conservation District, call one of the wineries, find out how much water they pump to irrigate. All of the apple trees which were non-irrigating which have been converted to vineyards that is irrigating, all the pasture land which is non-irrigating, which is now converted to irrigated. You can get an idea of the increased in the amount of water that is being utilized here and you can see why people are reporting that their wells are drying up, that tributaries which normally ran before are dry, that creeks that people swam in 20 years ago or when they were kids don't have water in them anymore. I mean you hear about this all the time so I don't understand how the County Planning Department, PRMD, could possibly say that they really don't know or there isn't information. It's all over the place and all you have to do is talk to somebody who has lived here for 20 years and they can give you an idea of what's going on. Furthermore, I'm sorry I came in late so I haven't heard all of the discussion but I did notice in the written handout that you're discussing two or three main points which you say are the key ones that people wanted to talk about; management, water supply, groundwater, gravel mining. I don't see anything here about water quality. The pesticide runoff is one of the things that I brought up at the last workshop and I haven't heard anybody from Marin Water District for example talking about it or I didn't hear anybody at that last meeting that was in Sonoma address this - that there are pesticides that are being used in the Russian River watershed. That the vineyards that cover the Russian River valley are not organic. They use pesticides.

Tom: Ann, if I can just interrupt you for a second, I don't know if you heard the time limit rule and thirty-second warning.

Ann Maurice: I see it. I didn't know if you had a time limit or not. There are pesticides that are being used in this watershed adjacent to the wells that are your water supply and I forget which well it is but it's well known that one of the collectors is influenced by surface water. I mean it doesn't take rocket science to realize that there is a danger of pollution by pesticides some of which cause breast cancer and it's all over the news that Marin County has got the highest rate of breast cancer in the world. So, I don't understand how people are not interested in discussing this. This is one of the key topics that you need to be talking about immediately. Get this out there and preserve your water supply. Thank you very much.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: I've been pouring over this and in regards to number 11 and 13 I have some problems with the language. Watershed restoration costs appropriately allocable to water contractors. I mean, what is the environmental harm here? How do we quantify the loss of value of the environment as a result of these water systems? It seems to me to some extent it'll depend on what water systems you ultimately select to develop. What opportunities exist for avoiding environmental costs? What's included in this? For instance, I'm fairly certain the unnatural releases from the dam have caused bank erosion in the lower river which in turn have caused the loss of fishing holes and a number other environmental problems. The river is listed for sediment as a problem. Part of that could be a result of the operation of this system. How is that all going to be quantified? So, I don't see the focus as being on avoiding environmental harm or restoring any environmental damage. You're mentioning it but it's not receiving a priority and it's not being quantified in a way that could be measured. Thank you.

Tom: Let me add one other sort of process idea that Brenda's comments raised for me. And that's for me, I've said to a few people now and I don't want to put you on the spot but could you turn that around into a proposal? You know, it should say this instead of that, or it might address this instead of that etcetera. I realize that could be tough to do on the spur of the moment here. You will have an opportunity to provide comments after this evening and still get into this round of activity. Now, I believe the notice said the deadline was March 1st. With this being a short month - that's tomorrow, but John and I think the schedule will permit another week. Okay, so March 8th I believe is a Friday. Comments to John by March 8th. He'll be able to fold into the next round what been generated here.

Brenda Adelman: That's a little hard for some of us. We're just volunteers. We're not getting paid to be here like half the people in the room. All I'm asking is, you can take what you've got here and just give a much deeper analysis and definition of terms and to some extent you'll be responding to what I'm saying. Thank you.

Tom: And that's a fair point that we're asking people who are doing this in their spare time, this is not their day job, to do a tremendous amount of work. You've already shown us that you are capable and willing to do that. Rather impressive, I must say. What you've done and I understand those limitations but we still encourage you to do what you can - as much as you can.

John Nelson: Let me give you some thoughts here where I was coming from on 11 and 12. First of all, I was not assuming that the contractors would not be willing to step up to the plate and pay their fair share of what's necessary to protect fish and to preserve or recreate a good habitat along the Russian River. I think the contractors are willing to do that. What I was trying to get at here is the fact that there is no overall plan now nor is there an overall allocation of costs. The

Agency basically has two ways of raising money for these purposes. One is from taxes which are levied on all property in the county. A portion of that goes into the pot which is used for these kinds of environmental endeavors. Agriculture contributes to that. How much, we don't know. All the people in the cities contribute to that through their property taxes. North Marin and Marin Municipal pay in-lieu taxes in the form of a per-acre-ft charge on water purchased from the aqueduct system. We know how much those dollars are. They're put in the Russian River Project Fund. It has nothing to do with the flood control zone funds by the way Diane. But there is no overall budget that shows what the plan is, what the costs will be, what the share coming from agriculture via taxes, from recreation and so forth is. And I think there's a concern among the contractors that we need that kind of plan. That's what I was trying to get out with this language. Not to minimize the obligation at all.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: I wanted to talk a little bit. I think that the points about who pays for what are extraordinarily important and I think the aspects of your concerns that you raised about how much can you pass on to your ratepayers and how those costs can be allocated. Those are extraordinarily important and I think there's one nexus point that perhaps gives us an operational standpoint to be able to define what a lot of this is about. And that is the proposal for surface water treatment plan. Unfortunately, the documentation for that, the engineering reports have been kept secret in defiance of the California Public Records Act request by the Water Agency and by the Board of Supervisors. Because in that documentation is a full report on the rationale for why spend \$600,000 of ratepayer money with Boyle Engineering of Santa Rosa. That information has not been shared with the ratepayers, the contractors, or the public. In there, would be some analysis by Boyle Engineering with consultation with Water Agency staff and I assume that no contractor staff has been participant in this because none of this is in the records, some rationale for why surface water implant is being considered and let's not assume that it's all being blamed on NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service) saying that the fish can't get over Wohler Dam. J. Jaspers, talking to Marin Municipal Water District, said this was a \$500 to \$700 million-dollar proposition last May. The cost estimate had gone up one hundred million dollars from when it was presented to the WAC in February last year. So add inflation and financing and cost overruns and you're into basically a billion or two billion dollar proposition that will come down the pike to the ratepayers. So that maybe the nexus point on looking at what we need to do is to decide what do we need to do as water suppliers, as an agency, as stewards of this system to avoid having to be that filtration plant. And if we look at what the inflows are, what the pollutant loads are, what the requirements for withdrawal are, what the sources are, what all the pollutant loads, all the compromises to our water supply are, and start addressing those as a program to avoid having to use a filtration plant, then we have something very clear to hang all of this stuff on, because then we have not only the requirements for water quality data that already exists but we can look at things that aren't regulated but we know are problematic like chlorination byproducts, pharmaceuticals, estrogenic chemicals, pesticides, herbicides, the things that come through a filtration plant even when its operating at best speed. As Robert Kennedy Jr. pointed out last night, introducing the Russian River keeper, Milwaukee had over 100 people die from water that went through their filtration system from cryptosporidium, and 400,000 people made sick. And this is a highly functioning treatment plant. Well, what do we have to do to protect the quality of our watershed so that we don't have to build a plant and look at that as an avoided cost to ratepayers. New York City has avoided a \$6 billion plant for a program that is being overseen by National Academy of Sciences of protecting their five county watershed for a cost of under a billion and a half dollars. That can give us some very specific points to address in designing a contract, in designing a water supply master agreement that we have target points; one of which and perhaps the most significant one, is how do we avoid having to build a filtration plant. We need the documentation from the Water Agency. I would hope the contractors would keep asking

for it. I'm going to go back with the California Public Records Act request and if I can't get it, will go from there.

Pam Torliatt, Petaluma City Council Member. I just wanted to respond and make a clarification on the comment about what the CAC had heard on Tuesday night at the County General Plan which is some of the findings from the Kleinfelder study that the county did look into. And they talked about the fact that PRMD has no means of enforcement to require property owners to meter the amount of groundwater that they pull out. They have no way of tracking information and as far as well water depths, they don't track at this point and time. They talked about 4 hour peaks on drawdown tests and Kleinfelder is recommending that you need at least 12 to 24 hour tests to get an accurate reading. They talked about the fact that well sites that are drilled in the county are identified by address, they're not identified by specific site location. So, and they also talked about the need to drill three sites to determine what the depth and the direction of water flow is. They're only drilling one now in order to get the wells put in place. And I agree with this lady that you know the county residents, you talk to county residents, you talk to the old timers, you talk to people that live in Pengrove in the second district and they'll tell you about the problems they are having with their ground water but the county isn't tracking it yet. And some people will respond and say "yes, we've started on studies", and yes, there are some studies that are being done in water scarce areas and very small areas of this county. And the Water Agency is doing some basin studies but it far from being comprehensive. It doesn't include the second district in Sonoma County. Most recently, I've tried to determine how much the water contractors have pumped during the last season. According to the impairment MOU that the Water Agency and all the contractors sign, how much everybody pumps. I can't, I've asked for it twice at Water Advisory Committee meetings. I want the information and we can't even get it from each other. So, we need to start sharing information and we need to be putting it on paper so people have some facts. Thank you.

Ann Maurice, Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water: I would say that we all need to be careful of being bulldozed by bullwackey. The people would have you believe that you need to spend millions of dollars on extensive studies to find out exactly how many cubic centimeters, you know to the centimeter, how much water is being used. If I have a box full of merchandise and I know that I've sold half of it, that may be all that I need to know to reorder that same quantity to fill up my same box again. I don't need to count every single item in the box. The parallel that I'm trying to draw is that we're being led to believe that we have to do these extensive studies to find out exactly what is going on and how many wells, and what they're drilling in the 24 hour tests, the 48 hour test. All you need to do is to get anecdotal evidence that you're describing from the various people who have lived here or the Department of Fish & Game who is prowling through these tributaries every day. They know what creeks are dry now that were not dry 5 years ago. This information is out there. There are so many high paid bureaucrats who are walking around with \$60,000 a year salaries who ought to know the change in the water use pattern in this county and if they don't, let's find different ones. There are other people looking for the job. To flip around what I said from the negative to the positive, to make a suggestion: you need to add water quality to your list of priorities. It's preposterous to be talking about the potential for a water treatment plant for Sonoma County and for Marin County and so forth whoever uses this Russian River water, without talking about water quality. Precisely, to eliminate the need for it by removing all the potential pollutants. And the biggest one that I was talking about is herbicides that are used by the agricultural operations up and down the watershed. So, what do you do? You say, no herbicides, pesticides used in the Russian River basin. That makes sense to me. No carcinogens. Which means, no Roundup. Roundup is linked to non-Hodgkins lymphoma. Why would you want that to runoff to your water supply wells for? No simazine. That's called a notorious ground water polluter. Why would you want that to runoff into your water supply for,

especially since it's been linked to breast cancer? No 2-4-D, equivalent of Agent Orange. I mean, there are some crazy pesticides and nobody has even thought to regulate, eliminate, do you even have to regulate? I mean, aren't these grape growers interested in having us buy their products? Why would they want to be using these things right in front of our faces, under our noses, in our water supply? There should be no further water diversions. If you don't know how much water is being used in the watershed and Fish and Game says that the creeks are going dry, then common sense tells me, tell the Water Resources Agency to stop granting further water diversions. And I would suggest that you not work with the Russian River watershed council as mentioned here. I've been part of that and I got out of that. It's the most disorganized, discredited, coo coo operation. Get involved with them and you'll just go to hell in a basket. Thank you.

Chris DeGabriele, North Marin Water District. I just wanted to talk about three things real briefly. One is water quality. All of the contractors are extremely interested in providing high water quality for our customers. Riverbank filtration is one of the best means of maintaining water quality on an economical scale. We want to see that continue. We have no interest in developing a surface water treatment plant if it's not absolutely necessary and we don't yet have information on the analysis that's being done by the Agency. We are aware of the analysis that's being done but we have not had detailed information about that. The water quality in the Russian River that's delivered to our customers continues to be of excellent quality and I think there's some charts up...no that's gravel elevation but there's 40 years of data that shows no diminishment of water quality delivered to our customers while the Russian River system has been in operation. There have been surrogate studies with chemicals such as caffeine that can easily be found in the water if it were present, and it's not found. We're very sensitive to the emerging contaminants that we're facing. Some of these disinfection byproducts are current contaminants that we must deal with and we are spending an awful lot of money with our local suppliers to combat that. The Russian River supply is of excellent quality. It continues to be that way. We don't have disinfection by-product concerns with that and we want to see that maintained.

Tom: I just want to comment that water quality is a topic that we've got allocated for the last portion of the program this evening. No need to repeat comments that you've made about water quality up to this point.

B. Water Supply:

14 *Same as Item 10 above*

15 *As part of the negotiation process review information on beneficial uses being made of Russian River waters and Eel River diversions.*

16 *Provide support for State of California Department of Water Resource and SCWA in updating enumeration of all water uses being made of Russian River waters including water imported from the Eel River.*

17 *Provide support for updating Russian River model studies to calculate yield of system under various hydrologic conditions.*

I'm Dan Ihara, Arcata, California in Humboldt County working with Friends of Eel River and I have something that should make Tom very happy because he's been asking for this all evening. I have a proposal. I have five words I would like to add to number 15. And if I could just come up here I would like to point those out. I'll read this and then I'll indicate the five words that I've added. As part of the negotiation process, review information on beneficial uses being made of,

and here's the addition, 'and negative impacts arising from' Russian River waters and Eel River diversions. I think this is an eminently reasonable suggestion. If a group of cities who we're trying to put in a freeway. Would they study only the beneficial uses of a freeway and not the negative impacts arising from it? So it seems like it's eminently fair. I'm curious, this is the only proposal I've heard so far. I'd be curious to know: Does anybody here object to this that does not support this as improvement for number 15? I know it's kind of hard to lay this on you all at once but what people would support including this? What people would support looking at the negative impacts? Seven, nine, whatever out there that do support. I have a second proposal regarding number 17, which is to add a section that I'll indicate. The first part of 17 would remain the same. I'll just read that for context. Provide support for updating Russian River model studies to calculate yield of system under various hydrologic conditions, and here's the proposed addition...'and provide for developing water supply planning options based on the possibility that Potter Valley Project might not be relicensed by FERC (the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) in 2022, or might be de-commissioned prior to then. I want to say that I think this is an eminently reasonable addition because this is a real possibility. The license does expire 20 years from now. Not to consider this possibility would be imprudent I would think. When there's a change of ownership of a dam, the American Society of Civil Engineers has recommended that de-commissioning be considered. So it's a real possibility that could come up at any time and so it would be imprudent not to consider these and I would like to give both of these to John. He agrees with them. Since they are the only specific language proposals, I would be very surprised if they were not included in the negotiations. Thank you.

John Blayney, Sonoma Valley, I have a proposal which is to bundle the alternatives into maybe 3 to 5 packages. Try to quantify them and nobody will be happy with the quality of the quantification but I agree very much with the lady's statement that you don't wait to monitor every well in Sonoma County. You push towards rational agreement by looking at these packages and seeing what you can combine and what you can take from one to another. There are kinds of things like maximum environment, minimum cost, early reliance on Lake Sonoma, regional equity, build a filtration plant, don't build a filtration plant. You could put together several packages and then try to see how far apart they are and what ones people would sign on to. Thank you.

Follow-up comments received after workshop that Mr. Blayney asked be inserted in the transcript in-lieu of above.

"Prepare broad brush analysis of alternative policy packages for provision of water to serve projected 2040 population of Sonoma County. Costs and regulatory implications of component policies should be estimated without regard to potential sources of funds.

The purpose is to provide lay stakeholders with a basis for evaluation of alternative policy components. A yes/no vote on each of the 56 points cannot achieve this objective.

1. MAXIMUM STEPS TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY

Terminate or reduce Eel River diversion

Determine limits for Russian River gravel mining.

Assume filtration as needed.

Assume use of Lake Sonoma water as needed.

Consumer conservation.

Recycling to maximize environmental benefit.

Restore regional and local watersheds/creeks by maximizing percolation and limiting use.

Determine potential for increase in irrigated agricultural land.

2. MINIMUM CHANGE IN CURRENT POLICIES

Assume continued Eel River diversion at expected levels.

Assume continuation of Russian River gravel mining until acceptable limit is determined by consensus.

Assume filtration as needed.

Assume use of Lake Sonoma water as needed.

Assume compliance with state/federal environmental regulations.

Assume recycling to extent of economic benefit to contractors.

Determine potential for increase in irrigated agricultural land.”

Tom: Is there anyone we haven’t heard from at all this evening. We certainly want to make sure we hear from you before we get to anyone else.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: I agree completely with Mr. Ihara’s questions about the costs to the systems that the water is taken from. The other is that, and this also relates to item 43, about the Potter Valley Project. Right now there is, as far as I know, an existing although stagnant contract to buy the Potter Valley Project. It was put on hold because the state prohibited PG&E from selling. That, however, is in flux. If you read that contract it states that the Water Agency and its contractors and customers, would be responsible for all environmental remediation due to that project. That is potentially a multi-billion dollar obligation to the ratepayers of this system. It is undefined but it is defined explicitly. The language is there. If you don’t have a copy of the contract, get it from SCWA, ask Randy for it, the language is there. We’re on the hook if that contract is executed. Cancel it. That should be a part of this agreement, Amendment 12 or whatever you call it. Cancel that contract. Do not buy PVP, period.

John Rosenblum: My comment mainly is focusing on water uses, rather than water services. And what I’m trying to suggest is if we look at and enumerate water services then the possibility of providing those services with recycled water, with efficiency doesn’t depend, doesn’t emphasize the need to expand supplies. And so just to use the word service rather than use.

George Amaroli, North Marin Water District Board Member: I used to work for the PUC (Calif. Public Utility Commission) when we regulated the energy utilities and I suggested that they keep regulating them but they didn’t listen to me. Anyway, the Potter Valley Project and other hydro projects of PG&E cannot be sold for six years. That’s the current situation. Now we can’t predict beyond that time who would operate them and whether they will be sold or not but I think if anything we’re moving away from de-regulation to some degree.

John Nelson: The water contractors have not approved purchase of the Potter Valley Project. If the Board of Supervisors or the Water Agency signs such an agreement, they’re not going to be able to bring those costs into the current agreement unless the contractors approve the purchase and they would be foolish to sign an agreement like that without in having the contractors on the hook first. Contractors are not on the hook at this moment and no purchase plan has been presented to them.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: That’s fine if you think the contractors are not on the hook, then the contractors should put in the new agreement that the Water Agency should cancel that contract period. And the contractors take absolutely no obligation for any of the costs associated with that contract as it is written and signed and sitting on ice at the moment.

Remediation in the Eel River is probably a multi-billion dollar operation. It took 90 years of loss of water from the Potter Valley Project. I don't think we want to sign up our ratepayers for that obligation.

Unidentified Person: I just want to make a comment on this discussion in that other hearings that I have attended in the past that are with FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, is that the Water Agencies is not the one that is asking for the Potter Valley Project but that it is the contractors who are asking.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: One issue that might be pertinent here. I'm just wondering, I think there's an assumption that the system's going to grow and that water supply will need to increase to accommodate that growth and I think you need to address the issue of the change in groundwater availability as more impervious surfaces are created. And that's all a water quality issue as well. And I'm also concerned, I haven't quite figured out how to verbalize it, but I'm worried that while you're including a lot and you're making an effort to be inclusive, I'm concerned that there's not enough consideration of cumulative impacts in what we've done so far in regard to other use of the resource of the water such as well I know you're going to look at gravel mining I believe but also the wastewater and other impacts on the water supply and water quality. And just looking at this subject in a vacuum is not the direction that most of us who are concerned about the environmental want to see us go in. I mean there needs to be some integrated approach to looking at all of these issues and I know that's hard, maybe too big, too much to put on the plate of the water contractors, but somehow and at some point this needs to be addressed. And maybe the general plan's a place to do it but I'd also like to see this effort at least address those issues to some extent. Thank you.

Goeff Cartwright, Petaluma. I'm not sure that you can separate watershed management from water supply because the water supply has been mismanaged. We've got the Eel River being diverted into the Russian River because the Russian River is now dry and we're sucking dry the Eel River. One of the real good indicators of this is the dead or dying fishing industry of California because they don't have the spawning grounds for the fish to return. I think we need a separate board, an independent board for the Water Agency because presently it is the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors that acts as the board for the Water Agency and I'm afraid they are far too influenced by what I have to call the irresponsible development money machine. Thank you.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: Just two other items on water supply. One is that provisions in the contracts should allow for summer time, or I'm sorry for wintertime replenishment of ground water storage basins. Which is right now functionally prohibited by the way the Amendment 11 is written based on the caps on the water supply. So that the contract needs to allow for that because really what we're talking about in large part is meeting the peak flow periods and we've been trying to get it all from the rivers and the ground water at the worst time and, of course, if we can avoid that by identifying and filling ground water basins during the winter when there is ample water to do that, the contract should encourage support and make that not just feasible but likely. The other of course is that water supply includes avoided water use and there's not enough conversation about that. If we don't have to use the water, then that is water that becomes available in the system and the last part of that is that the water that the contractors and the customers don't use we should have a new policy that water stays in the river or in the ground. So that there is, in fact, a reward for conservation activities that is directly going into the environment and that is, you don't use it, you don't sell it to somebody else, the Russian River is not just an income stream, the water stays in the river and in the ground.

Tom: Okay, we're going to move on and again we want to make sure we get through all the topics. The remaining comments we'll pick up at the end of the evening as time permits. Ground water/gravel mining. Again, if you've already...we've got a number 10 listed here and it's appropriately under this section but no need to repeat a comment made earlier, we'll carry those over to the degree they apply here. So, comments on the points raised under Ground water. Let's start with ground water then move to gravel mining.

C. Ground Water/Gravel Mining:

Ground Water:

- 32 *Same as Item 10 above.*
- 33 *To the extent that ground water studies undertaken by SCWA benefit parties to the agreement, that the agreement provide a mechanism for identifying the appropriate portion of costs to allocate to the each benefiting party.*
- 34 *Provide that the new agreement recognizes the reliable local supply capability of water contractors. (One purpose for doing so is to assist in determining how water should be allocated during certain types of water supply shortages.)*
- 35 *Include provisions of the MOU regarding WAC approval of funding for standby local peak month production capacity projects.*
- 36 *Provide for debt financing of viable local municipal wells together with equitable repayment arrangements by the benefited party.*
- 37 *Expand definition of conservation to include programs and strategies that encourage replenishment of local ground water where such replenishment could reduce demand on the Russian River.*
- 38 *Support measurement of extractions from all large wells impacting the underflow of the Russian River or urban ground water basins used conjunctively with aqueduct water.*

Gravel Mining:

- 44 *Provide for appropriate monitoring and periodic reports on riverbed elevations at cross-sections in the vicinity of the collectors and tracking of elevations over time.*
- 45 *Provide for periodic reports on caisson capacity under critical seasonal and hydrologic conditions.*

John Nelson: A point of clarification, the 11th Amended Agreement does provide water for replenishment of ground water basins. It's called surplus water and there is surplus water available in the winter months.

Diane Riley-Torres, PCA. I just want to mention 32 is the same as Item 1 which refers to public input. And I just wanted to say hats off to the Water Agency for having this kind of forum. I'm just an average citizen, a housewife, and it's nice to be able to come and ask questions and get responses. And I encourage you to have more of these. And John Olaf Nelson, I've never met the man before, but we've been emailing back and forth. You can actually email and ask a question

and get an answer and I think that's really important for citizens to understand these issues because it is kind of confusing so thank you very much.

Ann Maurice, Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water: I'd like for you to explain what you mean by number 37, expand the definition of conservation to include programs and strategies that encourage replenishment of local ground water. Are you talking about injection into the aquifer? Are you including that? There was a notorious plan, which was dumped by the agency and by the City of Santa Rosa years ago and the public was vehemently opposed to this and I am hoping that it's not rearing its ugly head again. It would be a travesty for us to be utilizing the good rainwater that falls naturally and somehow think of recycling our wastewater into our water supply. I saw a recent article not too long ago in the Press Democrat about the infamous toilet-to-tap proposal. Is that what this is referring to?

John Nelson: No. What we're talking about is slow-the-flow type programs by residents. Any place where there is green growing things and usable ground water basins and runoff coming into that area, to provide for ways and means to get that runoff back into the ground.

Ann Maurice, Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water: I'm sorry I didn't understand what you meant there. How would conservation replenish....it says your expanding the definition of conservation to include a program that encourages replenishment. What kind of program would replenish local ground water?

John Nelson: Okay, let me clarify. Currently the agency has, through the contractors, is raising \$15 million, which is devoted to conservation programs. That money's going back to the contractors and being added to money they're spending on conservation. Those conservation programs are all currently designed to reduce end uses of water. What I'm proposing here, based on what we heard at the public hearings earlier, was that the conservation program which involves education and outreach, include educational materials for slow-the-flow type activities where you have usable ground water basins but you have development which has reduced the amount of water that can get into those basins through covering up with asphalt and so forth. So it would be efforts that the average person could do which would be promoted through the existing structure of conservation programs.

Pam Torliatt, Petaluma City Council Member: Regarding Diane Riley's comment, a clarification. It is the water contractors who are paying for this. The contractors are the ones that wanted to have this forum and the Water Agency is overseeing the contract but. This is being paid by the ratepayers and instigated by the representatives of the contractors. Thank you.

Chris DeGabriele, North Marin Water District: I just wanted to point out, as an example, the two views being expressed here: David Keller advocating aquifer recharge and Ann Maurice opposing aquifer recharge. This is the forum that we're dealing with. I think it's a good idea to try and recharge the ground water aquifer myself. North Marin doesn't directly benefit from that. There's no viable municipal ground water in Marin County but certainly for Petaluma, Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park folks, if that's viable for them, we'll certainly support that.

Just to make sure we've gotten to everyone at least once first.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: This thing I mentioned before about impervious surfaces is popping up in a lot of different ways and perhaps it's being alluded to by others but maybe it would be good to even specifically define an example of a program which could include limiting the amount of impervious surface in new development and finding

ways to limit the amount of cement that is utilized and this is especially true for such things as big mall parking lots. Because there are two problems; one has to do with ground water recharge and another problem is one of the biggest sources of pollution to the river is surface runoff in the winter - the worst pollution that's coming into the river. So if the water could sink down into the ground, we could eliminate a lot of that problem. So it's a very important thing to look at right now. Thank you. *(tape change)*

George Amaroli, North Marin Water District Board Member: The San Gabriel Valley Water District area has almost the perfect basin. That is, you put an acre-foot in, you get 95 hundreds of an acre-foot out of it. You don't have those kind of sandy conditions existing in much of the Sonoma County. So before you get into a program where you're going to develop extensive ground water and rely on what you think might be replenishment, you may find yourself with a very non cost-effective program. When you dig these wells and you suddenly lower the water tables and there is no way in the world of raising them so you'd better before you drill, find out if you're drilling in a perfect basin or an imperfect basin or something in between that might work because you can get into a lot of folly with these kind of programs. Also, your water quality may not be the best.

Lee Harry, Valley of the Moon Water District: Regarding item 34, this is going to be an item that we'll be bringing up during the negotiating process but the idea providing that the new agreement recognizes the reliable local supply capability of water contractors particularly in our particular instance where we've developed over a 20% local supply by drilling our own wells and refurbishing wells in our area. We don't really look upon that as a real reliable water supply and what's been done in other areas of the state is that people who have water available in local production capacity during a drought would certainly volunteer that. But I would hate to see that become part of an overall agreement where that would be considered part of our overall water supply because Lord knows what happens and I just want to make it clear, our status on that point, if we have water available during a period when its needed by other contractors we'll certainly pump to our ultimate capacity at the local level. But we certainly wouldn't want our allotment influenced by that local supply.

Tom: Has anyone not had a chance to speak at least once on this topic? Let's do this, let's move to gravel mining. We'll take any extra time we've got to recycle through these topics. I think some people have addressed some of these. At least item 37 I know came up. Okay, let's look at gravel mining and we'll come back if we've got any additional time.

Goeff Cartwright, Petaluma, and most of you in this room I'm sure that you know that the Ranney collectors, which are our wells, the Sonoma County's Water Agency's wells, go 40,50 feet beneath the Russian River into all of that gravel that lies underneath the Russian River. That gravel is our water tank. I don't think that gravel mining is advantageous to our water supply. Thank you.

Bill Phillips, Petaluma. Something that I've suggested and others have mentioned is the lack of evidence of a water ethic or stewardship in the list of the 56 questions and as a perfect example, here these two items 44 and 45 skip over the fact that there's great concern about monitoring some of the contracts that exists that are going to be contested in court and the Water Agency seems to say well that's not our business. Well, I think it is very much the Agency's business and that's part of what I think is a water ethic and a water stewardship that the SCWA would participate actively and aggressively in quantifying what's happening with the aquifer. The tonnage removed in the past, the huge pits, certainly that's declined the function of the aquifer as our population grows and now we're skimming gravel bars with no knowledge of what the

starting point is, how much did come down last winter, nobody knows, and we're going to go on from there and skim gravel bars and find out who knows what later on. So I think that the Water Agency should expand their inquiry and posture on this issue of gravel mining. Thank you.

I wanted to follow up on that comment. One of the concerns I have about this list we were provided with, some of it doesn't reflect what I heard myself at the first two workshops. This language is very soft compared to the comments that I heard from the public. To monitor and make reports or provide periodic reports was not at all the way I heard the people who attended the workshop describe it. Many of them wanted the gravel mining to stop and there were several people that pointed out that they felt that this was the most egregious example of the built-in conflict of interest with having the Board of Supervisors which gives out the permits be the same one that has the charge of guarding the resource.

Judith Olney, Healdsburg Area for Responsible Citizens. I happen to live right on the Middle Reach. I happen to live looking at the aquifer that is the naturally filtering water system for your water supply. I cannot understand why the water contractors aren't taking some action to protect this valuable resource. The gravel miners have, over this last summer, just mined over 50 more acres of your precious water holding gravel. If we need water here in Sonoma County, why are we allowing people to pull and extract out this precious gravel? Another area that is really surprising to me is that the City of Healdsburg is proposing to take their secondary sewerage water and dump it directly into Pond 5. Now Pond 5 was just dug by SIRE Industries. It's a pond that's over 80 feet deep. The Water Quality Control Board is opposing this as are the neighbors because this would be a direct injection well of secondary sewerage directly into your ground water. This is a ground water that feeds the wells for half a million people. I don't understand why I'm not seeing more of the community being concerned about that. A third area of attack, looking at the cumulative impacts on the Middle Reach, is that the City of Santa Rosa is looking at building some very large wastewater reservoirs in the hills that feed the streams that again go directly right down into the wells for the Water Agency. So here we have the most precious aquifer for your water system. It's under attack. It's under attack by wastewater. It's being mined by the gravel industry and I believe the water contractors should be there and oppose any additional permits by the Board of Supervisors for, again, we just mined 50 acres this last summer and the SIRE Industries owns over 145 acres in that precious aquifer. Thank you.

Tom: Thank you. Let me just suggest this. If you have gravel mining comments, by all means continue to raise those but let's also open up the remaining 15 minutes to the other topics. Again, if you've already raised one of the others, water quality for instance has come up already this evening, we'll make sure that those comments get into the water quality discussion, no need to repeat those.

Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee: I just want to say that in regards to gravel mining, the Sonoma County Water Agency has been saying for at least 20 years that gravel mining has no impact on the wells of the system. Now probably the Water Agency and the Board of Supervisors, their directors, are the only ones in the county who believe that. There's all kinds of evidence that proves that that's wrong. The fact that the river has been listed for sediment pollution, now I recognize that not all sediments come from gravel mining, but to say none of them do would be preposterous. The wells of the agency have been silted in and there's a new need for the new well collector No. 6. The river's has dropped 10 to 20 feet in the Middle Reach in various places. Just to not look at this issue with clear eyes is just totally outrageous because that's one of the areas where the contractors are being forced to come up with so much money, I mean, collector No.6 is how many million, \$2 million, something like that? Would that

collector have been necessary if it wasn't for gravel mining? I'd love someone if they could answer that question. Thank you.

Chris DeGabriele, North Marin Water District: Yes the collector would have been necessary absent gravel mining. On the back wall are a couple of graphs showing the level of gravels in the Russian River in the vicinity of the collectors over the past 20 years, It shows no declination of the gravel levels in that area. Again, the water quality has been excellent. There have been moves by Santa Rosa to eliminate discharge of their highly treated effluent to the Russian River, which we applauded. We have commented on the ARM (Aggregate Resources Management) plan which identifies a discontinuation of gravel mining somewhere in the near future, I'm not certain anymore when that date is. John Nelson and myself have kicked the dirt around at the Benoist pit to convince ourselves that the Agency's facilities are not in danger from compromise of those gravel facilities. Much of the gravel mining, I believe all of it, is well upstream of the Agency's collectors. We do monitor it, the Agency monitors it, and it is a concern of ours but we don't see impacts on the water quality, which is our biggest concern - or water production for that matter.

Keith Kaulum, Sierra Club: I would want to raise an issue here, which has to do with both water supply and gravel mining. A couple of months ago, the Water Agency gave a report to the Board of Supervisors, I guess they were acting as their role of directors at that point, but one of the main points of that presentation was to show that in fact during the summer months that the water agency in fact could not meet their demands for delivery of water from the Russian River without raising what they call the "Rubber Dam." What this is, is a temporary dam, which raises the water level over the water intakes. And they showed a chart, which demonstrated that they had quite a large void of unmet demand if they could not raise the rubber dam. I think its very well known that the fisheries people in fact are looking at this very issue and trying to decide whether or not there is has a strong detrimental effect on the fisheries. And I think the word is it probably does. So I do think that our surface water in fact is somewhat in jeopardy from that point of view. I personally vote for the fish.

Jean Redus, Atascadero Green Valley Watershed Council: I just have a general comment. It's hard to fit my opinions into these little items, but my concern is for the, all of the animals and plants that share this watershed with us, as well as for the sustainability of our county as a place where we can all live for generations to come. And I strongly support adding the language of stewardship into every single part of any agreement made between the water contractors, supply contractors and agencies, and it's all so complicated. My water comes from a well. It doesn't come from any contractor and so I'm more concerned about where that water is coming from, you know, where it's been before it gets to me. There are so many different stakeholders with so many different needs and concerns and I really like John's idea of coming up with perhaps three different possibilities to see how people would go along with each, to come up with cohesive whole ideas rather than breaking things up into little bits, is the only way that we're going to have the kind of cohesive effort towards sustainability that will get us where we need to go to provide for generations yet to come.

Stan Gold, Petaluma: Assume a five-gallon jug. Fill the bottom third with gravel, and fill the rest of it to the top with water. Now remove the gravel. What happens to the water level? Well, without the gravel there, you're providing greater volume for the water. The water level is going to drop. Think about the Russian River. There was a time when the rubber dam near the Ranney collectors was not necessary because the volume around the collectors was sufficient. Now, a dam is necessary- the water level is lower. Why? Is it because we've changed the shape of the river by removing something from the river and now the water level is lower? I'll stop there.

John Rosenblum: This gravel mining section is exactly what I was talking about before. And it is so removed from the real issues and I think Anne Layzer expressed it. Let me get into the details of this one. Caisson capacity, we don't know that it's going down, it goes down periodically. The issue is why is it changing, why is it going down? The same with the monitoring, where's the quality monitoring Brenda mentioned? You know, there's an issue of whether it's influenced by surface water. And if we could add on items 46, 47 and 48 which are what are the effects of storage on maybe reducing the rate at which we try to pump out of those caissons and then getting back to the gravel mining itself, no one wants it.

Ann Maurice, Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water: I would say that the fact that you have not included "D" vineyard management describes most clearly the politics of water and the Water Agency and the Board of Supervisors. The reason that there is less water is because of all the pumping for agriculture and pumping for urban uses in the watershed. It's as simple as that. And unless there is a political resolve to stop the excessive pumping, our water supply is in jeopardy. Period. And unless we are willing to look at all of the chemicals that are used by these vineyard in the watershed our water supply is in jeopardy, so the omission of vineyards when that is the most glaring concern regarding water in the Russian River basin speaks more to the lack of resolution to really solve the problem than anything else I see here.

Alex Forman: Marin Municipal Water District Board Member. Real briefly, we're very concerned about water quality. We ran a test on water directly from the Russian River, not water that had even gone through the aquifer filter. We did not find detectable levels of dozens and dozens of pesticides, MBE, anything we looked for was not detectable at that point. We're very cognizant, we're not going to have our customers drink water that's full of toxins. So I really need to, as a publicly elected official... we're not allowing that to happen. Russian River water, as far as we've tested it, and it was the most extensive test I've ever seen, was pure. I just want to also say that in the midst of all this conflict, there is a hope here which is that people can begin to think as in a bioregional way, that we all are dependant on the same resources, and even if we have disagreements, if people can take that message out to your people that you work with and you live with that we all are trying to find a regional solution. I think there's a lot of hope for this process.

Pam Torliatt, Petaluma City Council Member: In response to something that Mr. DeGabriele was talking about in reference to gravel mining. It always occurs to me when people say we have good water quality, gravel mining isn't affecting our water supply, I think what would it actually be like if there was no gravel mining that had ever occurred? How good, how much better would our water quality be? It's not matter of whether its having an effect or not, and it stays at a certain level, its about how much better we can have it for our drinking water source, and how much better we can have it for our quality of life, and the other beneficial uses. We never are able to measure that impact. Thank you.

Andy Rogers, Cotati: I'm on the water resources subcommittee for the general plan. I'm completely overwhelmed with this subject and my head is swimming, to say the least, in clean water. Thanks for hosting this tonight. There's been a lot of good ideas in exchange. I think this is the best format of the three workshops I've been to. So, thanks to the Agency and the contractors. Just one specific proposal related to gravel mining, number 44, just the way it's written, it seems like its more an extraction management issue. If its under the gravel mining subject, you just might want to add in that we'll do it also in the vicinity of the gravel mines. Just as a specific suggestion. I'm looking forward to, in the overwhelmed category, to the Water Agency's policy that I think is coming out the 18th, or something, of March. And publicly

announced on the 25th, how that all is going to play into what this agreement is saying and what we're tasked with, with the general plan is an enormous question mark. And some other people brought up a grander vision is needed. I think that that is certainly true - a very difficult thing to do but it's needed. We need something in, hopefully in this agreement and in the general plan that work with one another. And in that vein, I'm just have an idea that I'll throw out there, In thinking about that, this county is unlike many others in that we have the Board of Supervisors both over the water agency board and also for the county Board of Supervisors. And I understand the conflicts that people bring up and the concerns they have, however, it could be a really great opportunity because in one body, one governing body, we have an opportunity to merge both land use decisions and water policy where this vision could take place, instead of having two competing governing bodies. So I'm not saying that that's what I want, but it's something to consider. Thank you.

Dan Ihara, Friends of the Eel River: I just had a few questions about process that is the next step. Is John going to revise the list of 56 issues and then that will be posted along with the summary of all these responses? And then also, I guess a follow-up question, is that when those 56 amended, or revised issues are developed, then what happens next? Is that just going to be a topic of other workshops, then eventually it will get proposed to the different contractors?

Tom: John?

John Nelson: I'm going to go out on a limb here, and not answer that first. I want to talk about gravel mining, and really share my heart with you, and the contractors can fire me over this, I'm supposed to be a facilitator and not be on one side or the other, but this issue over gravel mining - what the public perceives as the schizophrenia that the Agency and also it's contractors have over gravel mining. You need to understand, there is no schizophrenia. There is truth that supports the water contractor's position. I was manager of the North Marin Water District for 23 years; I was chairman of the Water Contractors group for that same period of time. Believe me, I looked real close at gravel mining and its potential impacts on the Agency's intakes. It's not there. The gravel depths where the intakes are didn't change. Now the capacity of a Ranney collector system does go down with time from siltation and a portion of that siltation comes from gravel disturbed in the winter months, but very, very minor. And Pam, if the gravel mining had not occurred in the river, the quality at the Agency's intakes would not have changed one iota. Now I believe that, after managing 23 years at North Marin, very very strongly. Gravel mining effects upstream are different. It depends on whose ox is getting gored. The lady from Healdsburg has a very legitimate case, but it did not affect the Agency's intakes or my customers and therefore we didn't get involved in that. The storage basin that the Agency draws water out of, where the intake collectors are located does not extend that far up where it's affected by the Benoist pit or other pits. The capacity is not affected. The reason that the rubber dam has gone in, is because we've exceeded the capacity of that local area, and it would have been exceeded whether gravel mining had occurred on the river or not. That's the truth of it, believe it or not, and I probably shouldn't have said that at all.

I want to go to the process question. The process is still evolving, what will happen is we will have a transcript, we might even have a streaming video on our site if that can be done, if we don't have that we'll have a transcript of the comments here that will be posted on the website. For everybody who turns in one of these forms (list of 56 possible responses with comments, changes additions), I will come up with a summary of public forms that will go in, and that will be in a report that will be finished in about a month. That report will also have a summary of comments that are coming in from the water contractors on this same list of 56 and their adds, so that report will have all of that information in it and will be given to the Water Advisory

Committee at their first meeting in April. That will also be given to the people who are drafting the agreement. The people who are drafting the agreement are Randy's attorneys right now, and I don't know how exactly how much of this will appear in the agreement. They have this information but the first draft of the agreement that's going to come out is going to be an Agency agreement. That will be our starting point. And to the extent that....., I'm almost finished here, that draft agreement, I'm told from the Agency will be out April 15 and that will be the starting point in negotiations. We have, on the website, the parties to the negotiation, the actual people, that are identified from each of the parties, the ten cities and districts and the Agency are designated and shown there. They will then commence to knuckle down and actually work on an agreement for a year. That first draft will be reviewed at our next workshop. That will be some time in the latter part of May, maybe the first week of June. We haven't set that date yet. And that's kind of the process at this point up until the next workshop.

Connie Madden, Petaluma: It seems to me that this process cannot be scientific or balanced or fair or sensible if you cannot put a question here regarding gravel mining which shows what amount of gravel will be needed in the next 20 years. You're talking about what happened in the past, and you've been able to say everything's fine, according to the experts. I've been to conferences and presentations where the experts from the gravel mining company were listened to, and that was taken as the evidence. I've transcribed tapes of a lot of information. Yeah, it looks good for the gravel miners, but no one has convinced me or even put the question out, how much gravel will be needed to keep the water clean in the next 20 years. You don't have anything that addresses it from that point of view in your process. How can you possibly, how can you possibly present information without putting the question there?

Tom closes the workshop because of the time and welcomes persons who want to stay and talk.

David Keller, Friends of the Eel River: It's a sham, it's a sham. What's the point of submitting it if they're already writing the contract?

Tom: I'm happy to talk while folks are moving.

Unidentified: John just raised a very important point, which is that the Water Agency lawyers are drafting the agreement as we sit here. And you can't guarantee that anything that we have said is going into those agreements. So that belies the very premise for these workshops in the first place. Which is that there is no buy-in from the Board of Supervisors or the Water Agency to any work that the contractors have been doing or that the public has been doing. And I would hope that Randy Poole, who is still here, would address this for us. Otherwise, what's the point?

Unidentified: I think that's one of the most distressing things I've ever heard. Here we are, giving input and we learn that the first draft is going to be out shortly before we've completed our deliberations. What's the point of deliberating if a draft is going to precede our work?

End